

A Simple Examination of the Two Natures of Christ

The early church, after many debates, established a formula to explain the relationship of the two natures of Christ at the Council of Chalcedon in 451. Throughout the centuries this formulation of the doctrine of Christ has been assaulted, especially in the 19th century by rationalists. In essence, it states that in the incarnation of Christ, the eternal Son of God assumed a human nature in addition to his divine nature. Though he is one person (*hypostasis*), the second person of the Trinity now has two natures. These natures remain distinct, whole and unchanged, without admixture or confusion, so that Jesus Christ is truly God and truly man. This is often called the 'hypostatic union'.

The problem has always been that this doctrine is a mystery which Christians are expected to believe in the form that it is stated in the New Testament. Man's problem is that he is expected to believe something he cannot possibly understand, so that he seeks ways to render the dual nature of Christ comprehensible; all of which result in reducing the deity of Christ. Examples of such theological degeneration include:

- Schleiermacher Christ is a man with a supreme God consciousness.
- Ritschl Christ is a man with the value of a God.
- Wendt Christ is a man in continual fellowship with God.
- Beyschlag Christ is a God-filled man.
- Sanday Christ is a man with the divine in his sub-consciousness.
- Harnak Christ is merely an ethical teacher.
- Weiss Christ is merely an apocalyptic seer.
- Schweitzer Christ is an exalted leader.

Louis Berkhof, having mentioned the above thinkers states that: *'It is of the utmost importance to maintain this doctrine, as it was formulated by the Council of Chalcedon and is contained in our [Presbyterian] Confessional standards.'*¹ If a respected theologian thinks this is 'of the utmost importance' (as indeed do many others), and if the historic orthodox church has endorsed this formula for nearly 1600 years, it is a great folly to think that we suddenly have an angle on this that no one has ever thought of and that we can reject Chalcedon, as some have recently said.

Although some aspects of this doctrine are hard to follow, if one perseveres the key difficulties can be overcome. The important thing is to give proper weight to all that the Bible says about the person of Christ and then seek to logically organise those statements together; avoiding rational extrapolations of just a few verses or deductions outside the wider context. As one does this, the mist begins to clear and the full significance of the glory of God's purpose in election and atonement becomes apparent and forms a rich basis for worship.

The Key - One Personality, Two Natures

The first thing is to establish what scripture categorically declares about the person of Christ; here we see that Christ is certainly God and also man.

¹ Berkhof, *Systematic Theology*, Banner of Truth (1971), p316.

Christ is God

Although it may be presumed that evangelical believers will automatically believe this, one can no longer take this for granted. No only are evangelicals espousing a variety of heterodox ideas, but many have been influenced by liberal theologians who deny, or at least diminish, Christ's deity. It is therefore, helpful to establish what scripture emphatically states about Christ.

<i>Divine names</i>	<i>'God manifest in the flesh'</i> , (1 Tim 3:16); also Isa 9:6, 40:3; Jer 23:5-6; Joel 2:32;
<i>Divine attributes</i>	Eternal existence, Isa 9:6; Jn 1:1-2; Rev 1:8, 22:13. Omnipresence, Matt 18:20, 28:20; Jn 3:13. Omniscience, Jn 2:24-25, 21:17; Rev 2:23. Omnipotence, Isa 9:6; Phil 3:21; Rev 1:8. Immutability, Heb 1:10-12, 13:8. Other, Col 2:9.
<i>Divine works</i>	Creation, Jn 1:3,10; Col 1:16; Heb 1:2,10. Providence, Lk 10:22; Jn 3:35, 17:2; Eph 1:22; Col 1:17; Heb 1:3. Forgiveness of sins, Matt 9:2-7; Mk 2:7-10; Col 3:13. Resurrection and judgment, Matt 25:31-32; Jn 5:19-29; Acts 10:42, 17:31; Phil 3:21 2 Tim 4:1. New heaven and earth, Heb 1:10-12; Phil 3:21; Rev 21:5.
<i>Divine honour</i>	<i>'All should honour the Son just as they honour the Father'</i> , (Jn 5:22-23). Also Jn 14:1; 1 Cor 15:19; 2 Cor 13:13; Heb 1:6; Matt 28:19.
<i>Divine worship</i>	<i>'Then those who were in the boat came and worshipped Him, saying, "Truly You are the Son of God"'</i> , (Matt 14:33). Also: Matt 8:2, 9:18, 15:25, 28:9,17; Mk 5:6; Lk 24:52; Jn 9:38.
<i>Divine perception</i>	Jesus knew he was God: Matt 11:27, 21:37,38, 22:41-46, 24:36, 28:19.

Christ is man

No professing believer denies this.

<i>Jesus was called a man</i>	Jn 8:40; Acts 2:22; Rm 5:15; 1 Cor 15:21.
<i>Jesus was manifest in the flesh</i>	Jn 1:14; 1 Tim 3:16; 1 Jn 4:2.
<i>Jesus had a human nature</i>	(a fleshly body and a rational soul). Matt 26:26,28,38; Lk 23:46, 24:39; Jn 11:33; Heb 2:14.
<i>Jesus had human needs</i>	Matt 4:2, 8:24, 9:36; Mk 3:5; Jn 4:6.
<i>Jesus developed normally</i>	Lk 2:40,52;
<i>Jesus suffered</i>	Heb 2:10,18, 5:8

Conclusion 1: Scripture very clearly states that Jesus is both God and Man. Just as his divine nature was complete, his human nature does not lack any essential qualities of that nature.

Explanatory terms

Very many people get confused on this subject because they misunderstand the meaning of the theological terms used. It is important to differentiate between 'nature' and 'personality'.

Nature (Gk. *physeis*), the essential qualities of something, that which distinguishes it. Although it has no personal subsistence, it does have consciousness and will (in church definitions).

Person (Gk. *hypostasis*), a responsible, independent, moral agent endowed with reason. Personality is not vital to nature, but comprises of nature with something added. A certain dog has a canine nature, and may be a noteworthy individual but it is not a person. My identity as a person remains constant whatever radical changes may affect my nature (infancy, childhood, maturity, senility, sickness, death etc.).

When the second person of the Trinity took on human flesh, that fleshly nature did not exist by itself as a person. The person with a divine nature added a human nature. The human nature of Christ never existed by its self, but only as subsisting in the person of the Son. Even in the womb, once created by the Spirit, it was united to the person of the Son.

If Christ's human nature existed as a person, then note the following problems:

- The actions of one nature could not be said of the other, e.g:
 - * the righteousness wrought by Christ in his human life, could not be said to be the righteousness of God.
 - * The blood shed by the human nature of Jesus could not be said to be the blood of the Son of God.
 - * God could not be said to purchase the church with his blood.
 - * The *Lord* of glory could not have been crucified.
- The Son of man could not have been said to be in heaven while he was walking on the earth.
- The blood of Christ would have had human value only and could not atone for a multitude of men.
- The righteousness worked out by the human nature of Jesus could not be applied to all the elect in justification.

Scripture declares that the human nature of the Son being formed in Mary's womb was a '*holy thing*' (Lk 1:35, neuter singular) not a holy person. The human nature only took on personality as it was united to the divine person of Christ.

[Nestorianism² was the name given to the error that Christ's two natures were so separated that they were actually two persons.]

Conclusion 2: Christ is one person but exists in two natures, both express a single personality. The human nature of Christ does not constitute a human person (is not independently subsistent); but it is not impersonal as it expresses the personality of Christ.

Christ is God and Man: *The Incarnation*

The starting point for the two natures is the virgin birth of Christ. From the Spirit Jesus took his own deity, and from Mary he took actual flesh. Two formerly contrasting natures met in the one person. From Mary he had to receive fleshly humanity, by the Spirit his divine nature was transmitted (Lk 1:35). This means:

- Jesus' person is expressed or revealed as God/Man.³
- There must be two components in Christ's person from these two sources of nature.
- By the incarnation Jesus actually takes humanity into the Godhead.
- Jesus was not man prior to the incarnation, or birth by a virgin would have been unnecessary. In any case we are informed that God is a Spirit. Previous theophanies

² Named after Nestorius, patriarch of Constantinople in 428 AD, who was misrepresented (mainly by Cyril of Alexandria), unfairly besmirched as a heretic and banished. We now know that he denied the charge and defended the orthodox view in his *Book of Heracleides*.

³'God/Man' is used here as shorthand for Christ as both man and God, it does not suggest (at least here) a new fused substance that is neither man nor God.

were the second person of the Trinity temporarily taking on a fleshly body as angels do. The adoption of flesh by an angel, to appear as a man, does not change the nature of angels from immaterial spirit to corporeal flesh.

- * The Bible states that God prepared a body for his Son (Heb 10:5).
 - * The Son took (*metecho*, became a partaker of) the nature of his children (flesh and blood) made of woman (Heb 2:14,16).
 - * Jesus took (*lambano*, to take with the hand, lay hold of, procure for one's self, claim, once taken it is not let go) the '*form of a servant*', the '*likeness of men*', '*human form*' (Phil 2:6-8).
- In this action there was no transmission of sin (this possibly implies that the principle of sin is transmitted by males, not the female ovum; or that the ovum was specially sanctified from a sinful disposition before the human soul of Christ was added to it and before the Son united it with his divine person). Scripture teaches that Jesus was not only sinless, but it was not possible for him to sin as a result of the union of the two natures (Lk 1:35; Jn 8:46, 14:30; 2 Cor 5:21; Heb 4:15, 9:14; 1 Pt 2:22; 1 Jn 3:5).
 - The divine nature did not change by addition or subtraction at the incarnation otherwise the immutability of God would be negated. It also remained impassible (did not suffer pain, weakness or temptation). The *person* of the Son assumed human nature. It was in this nature that Jesus suffered and died. The human nature was not added to the divine nature as the common essence of the Trinity, but as a peculiar subsistence in the person of the Son.⁴
 - Since the two natures are united in Christ's person unchangeably, they remain consistent to their properties throughout the incarnation. Therefore, the Son (in the divine nature) remained in heaven with God, whilst in his human nature he grew up as a man. The Son of God did not put aside the divine virtues (the infinite was not *changed into* the finite), but *assumed* a finite form (man). '*The eternal did not empty himself of eternity but assumed the temporal. The Lord of all did not cease to be Lord but assumed the form of a servant. Nor did the human nature in any sense change into the divine or assume divine attributes. In his human nature Christ was finite, temporal, limited in power, knowledge, wisdom and understanding, dependent and changeable.*'⁵

Conclusion 3: The starting point for the union of two natures in Christ was at the incarnation. Human nature was added to the person of the Son.

Christ's single personality

- Christ always spoke as 'I'; he never addressed another aspect of himself, unlike the Godhead where one person addresses another (Ps 2:7, 40:7-8; Jn 17:1,4,5 etc.).
- Unlike God, Jesus never identifies himself in the plural form. [Jn 3:11 refers to Jesus and his disciples as a rabbinical teaching group (v2).]
- Scriptures refer to both natures terminating in one person:
 - * '*... concerning His [single] Son Jesus Christ our Lord, who was born of the seed of David according to the flesh [human nature], and declared to be the Son of God with power according to the Spirit of holiness [divine nature], by the resurrection from the dead.*' Rm 1:3-4
 - * '*When the fullness of the time had come, God sent forth His Son [divine nature], born of a woman, born under the law [human nature].*' Gal 4:4
- It was the single divine person (not an abstract power or nature) which was united with human nature (Jn 1:14; Rm 8:3; Gal 4:4; 1 Tim 3:16).
- Actions of one nature are ascribed to the person while denominated by the other

⁴ (Sic) John Gill, *Body of Divinity*, Baker, (1978), Vol 1, p543.

⁵ Hoeksema, *Reformed Dogmatics*, RFP, (1985), p361.

nature, e.g. human attributes are predicated of the person designated by a divine title (Acts 20:28; 1 Cor 2:8; Col 1:13-14) and vice versa (Jn 3:13, 6:62; Rm 9:5).

Conclusion 4: The divine and human natures of Christ are clearly testified to in scripture but terminating in a single personality. The union of natures did not fuse into a new third substance (tertium quid; a divine-human nature as stated by Eutychianism).

Aspects of the person of Christ

We must exercise care in evaluating Christ's person. For instance, his personal divine nature (*logos*) is not the human soul/spirit of Christ. The Word (*logos*) is eternal, but the manhood of Christ was formed by the action of God in time, hence the soul/spirit of his human nature was created, it is contained in the word 'flesh', as meaning humanity (Matt 26:38; Mk 14:34; Lk 23:46). Without a human soul Christ could not have been a perfect man.⁶ Neither is the Word (*logos*) the common divine essence of the Godhead since only the second person is designated thus. Only the Word is made flesh. Many common phrases thus become erroneous like: 'the divine nature became flesh', 'human nature was united to the being of God' or even 'the man Christ stands in the divine nature'.⁷

Christ must have two wills, two consciences, two souls but only one personality. His human will was in subjection to his divine will (Jn 6:38; Lk 22:42), he expressed human emotions (Matt 26:38; Mk 3:5 10:21; Jn 13:23; Heb 4:15). Without a human soul he could not have redeemed ours (Isa 53:10; Heb 10:10). We have seen that Christ fully exhibits a divine nature and a human nature within his single person. This means that the fulness of human nature: spirit, soul, body must have been assumed, and yet without creating a second personality.⁸ How we cannot say, but we must insist that there is no separation of the two natures in Christ's personality. Though there is no mixture of the divine with the human, there is an inter-connection centred and unified in the person. The person of Christ correlates the human mind and the mind of God, the human will and the will of God, the human spirit and the Spirit of God. As a result, the Son is the perfect revelation of the Father.

Christ had a true body and a rational soul. When the word 'likeness' is used in connection with Christ's flesh, it has to do with the word 'sin' (Rm 8:3). His flesh looked like other men, who are all sinners, but he was not sinful. Likeness is not referring to a body that was like human flesh but wasn't really human flesh. This is the basis of the Docetic heresy which was an early part of Gnosticism.⁹

⁶ It was the Arians who first denied that Christ had a human spirit which was replaced by the *logos* (for them a divine-like nature, a created being); this was further developed by Apollinarianism later in the 4th century.

⁷ See John Gill, *Body of Divinity*, Baker, (1978), Vol 1, p539ff.

⁸ That the word 'flesh' incorporates the inner man see passages like Rm 3:20 and 1 Cor 1:29; the body cannot be justified or glory in anything.

⁹ Docetism taught that Christ was not a real man but only appeared to be so. This resulted from Gnostic dualism, which understood that God (who is spiritual and perfect) could not be involved with humanity (which was earthly and evil).

The Hypostatic Union

Christ assumed a human nature to his divine person, but both natures are united in his person. Assumption applies to one nature, union applies to two. In the flesh he is the Son of David; according to the divine nature (spirit of holiness) he is the Son of God (Rm 1:3-4). This union is termed 'hypostatic' since it applies to personhood, so the union is personal. However, it is not a union of persons but, as explained, a union of two natures in one person. The two natures do not communicate from one to another, i.e. there is no transmission of the essential properties of divinity to the human nature. Godhead (divinity) *dwells* in the body of Christ (Col 2:9). The human nature does not partake of the glory and perfections of God so that the human body is omnipresent and visible to all. The individual properties of the two natures remain unmixed.

The essence of the union is that the personality of the Son is revealed through both of the natures. As such, it is indivisible. Although death separated Christ's human soul from his body, it did not dissolve the union of the natures. This is why Christ was able to raise his human body up, declaring himself to be Son of God in power (Jn 2:19).

The need for Christ to be God/Man

The need for two natures in the atonement

- In order to redeem man, a representative man had to die. This man had to be perfect, just like any offering for sin had to be without blemish. A sinner cannot atone.
- In order to inherit God's covenantal promises given in the Old Testament, Christ had to live a perfect human life to gain the righteous man's inheritance.
- Unless Christ had also been God, the value of his sacrifice would have been a single life. As it is, his life is of infinite worth and can thus redeem an infinite number of sinners.
- As God, Christ can pass on the benefits of his perfect obedience to an infinite number of justified sinners.

The need for two natures in Christ's ascension ministry

- Only by fully entering into the daily experience of human life (as a man) could Christ be able to intercede meaningfully. He had to undergo the same trials and temptations, and suffer the same exigencies as us.
- Only by being God could he live without sin, suffer without complaint and intercede with power.

The results of Christ being God/Man¹⁰

- The properties of both natures belong to the person of the Son (though there is no communication of one nature directly with the other). Christ on earth was almighty and a man of sorrows, omniscient and limited, glorious yet suffered hunger. Christ is even spoken of in one nature yet with the properties of the other, e.g. the Son of God purchased the church with his own blood, or the blood of the Son cleanses from sin or the Lord of Glory was crucified (Acts 20:28; 1 Jn 1:7; 1 Cor 2:8). In this way the impassible God is thus able to suffer (in the human nature). Sometimes the human nature is ascribed divine properties as in: *'No man has ascended to heaven but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man, which is in heaven'* (Jn 3:13). [The Son was in heaven and earth at the same time as a person, but not his human nature.]
- This means that things can be true of Christ as a person, but not of one of his natures, e.g. the divine nature of Christ did not suffer, the human nature of Christ is not everywhere present; yet Christ suffered, Christ is omnipresent.
- The human nature was blessed with all sorts of spiritual gifts from the beginning: gifts of the Spirit, the association with the divine nature etc. which combined to ensure impeccability (no possibility of sin) and fulfilment of the divine will.
 - * As a man, Jesus was perfectly holy and totally sinless (Lk 1:35).
 - * He was habitually full of grace and truth (Jn 1:17).
 - * He was full of the Spirit in abundance (Jn 3:34-35).
 - * He was full of faith and obedience (Jn 14:31).
- Atonement was achieved by a combination of the divine and human elements united in the single personality of Christ.
 - * As God/Man and Mediator he is the Priest that offers.
 - * In his human nature he is the sacrifice offered.
 - * In his divine nature he is the altar which sanctifies the offering, giving it its atoning virtue.
 - * His human blood was shed for sin but his divine nature gives it an infinite value to cleanse the elect.
- After his resurrection, Christ's human nature is highly exalted and united with the person of the Son (Phil 2:9-10, 1 Pt 3:22).
- There is a sharing of office, power and authority in both natures. Christ is a mediator in the virtue of both natures, so also Prophet, Priest, King, Judge, Saviour, Lawgiver and source of eternal life.

A specific scripture for consideration

Isa 9:6

*For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The **mighty God**, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace.*

¹⁰ Theologians have traditionally spoken of a threefold result of the union: *communicatio charismatum* (communion of gifts), spiritual gifts are imparted to the human nature; *communicatio idiomatum* (of attributes, virtues), attributes of both natures are ascribed to the one person of Christ (note: Lutheranism errs here by stating that divine attributes are given to the human nature); *communicatio apostelesmatum* (of mediatorial activity), the co-operation of the two natures in redemption ascribed to the one person.

The eternal Son is here promised to be the Messiah. Jews understood it thus and so do Christians. That the Son is God is also clear, he is called 'el (Strong's 0410) the shortened form of God's name (0352). Occasionally it has the sense of 'mighty man' or a 'god', but is used of God 213 times out of 245 occurrences in the AV.

What is interesting is the additional adjective 'mighty'. This really isn't necessary as 'el carries that sense anyway. What is really significant is that the word 'gibbowr' (1368) carries the real sense of being a man. It's uses in the AV are:

- mighty 63, mighty man 68, strong 4, valiant 3, valiant ones 4, mighties 2, man 2, valiant men 2, strong man 1, upright man 1, champion 1, chief 1, excel 1, giant 1, men's 1, mightiest 1, strongest 1; total use: 158.

So, it is translated more often as referring to men than as an adjective for power. This means that a perfectly legitimate, and possibly better, translation of this phrase is: 'man-God' or 'mighty man-God'. At the very least, there is here a scripture which implies that the Messiah / Saviour will be a man as well as God.

Propositions from the scriptural statements¹¹

This is based upon James P. Boyce, *Abstract of Systematic Theology*, p289ff.

- There is one God - one divine nature, in three persons, distinct in personality but undividedly and unchangeably the same in essence, being and nature.
- God is three persons - Father, Son and Holy Spirit. The one undivided divine nature subsists in three persons.
- A divine person can become incarnate without the other members of the Trinity becoming affected, since the persons are distinct. The divine nature cannot become incarnate because it is common to all, the whole Godhead would become flesh.
- The second person of the Trinity, the eternal Son, united his person to a human nature so as to become a person in that nature - he became a man.
- In this union he assumed all that constitutes a man (body, soul and spirit). The personality of this man was the person that existed as the Son in the divine nature from eternity. A new personality was not constructed. The Son subsisted in human nature as truly as he did in the divine nature.
- In becoming man, he still remained God, because he still continued to subsist in the divine nature.
- The two natures were not merged.
- The same person who was God became man also, there were not two persons, one divine and one human.
- The Son never lost his separate conscious existence with either nature.
- Christ had all divine experience, by virtue of his divine nature. Christ had all human experience (except sin), by virtue of his human nature. He thought, willed and purposed as God (with omniscience, omnipotence and omnipresence) and as man (with limited powers, limited knowledge, suffering).
- The work of redemption necessitated this union of natures in one person. A being with only divine nature could not suffer. Human nature allowed God to suffer for men and identify with their weaknesses; but nothing was added to God's nature.
- In assuming human nature, the divine nature of Christ did not change, neither did the human nature become divine.
- The divine nature of Christ did not actually participate in the sufferings of the cross; yet

the person who suffered was Christ as God.

- The value of this sacrifice is infinite since it is the value of the person whose nature suffered.

Appendices

Appendix One

The *Emptying* of Philippians 2:5-8

In his state of humiliation (time on earth as a man) Christ voluntarily assumed a subordinate position to the Father in order to achieve the redemption of men. It was a subordination of one person to another because the divine nature is one, shared by all members of the Trinity. Christ's divine nature was not subordinated, weakened, or emptied because it is part of the shared divinity of the Godhead. Neither was Christ separated from his divine nature, but it was hidden from men behind the veil of his flesh. His right of rule, authority, power etc. remained (he was always equal with the Father), but his official exercise of it was yielded temporarily to the Father. On earth, Christ did the Father's will as an obedient servant. It is this situation to which the passage in question refers, and the purpose of introducing it was to encourage the church to be of a like mind in serving others, esteeming them as better - a subordination among equals.

The glory spoken of is the official position of rule, authority and dominion. As a result of Christ's submission, this glory is not only restored as the prerogative of the divine nature, but Christ's human nature is elevated to this status also so that every tongue will confess that Jesus (human nature)¹¹ Christ (divine nature) is Lord.

Some modern theologians have developed what is called the '*kenosis theory*' (from Gk. *ekenosen* - emptying) which suggests that Jesus emptied himself of his divine glory to become a man; they cite Phil 2:6-8; 2 Cor 8:9 and Jn 17:5. Modern translations have echoed this by using '*emptied himself*' in Phil 2:7, where the KJV and NKJV has '*made himself of no reputation*'. The idea that Christ laid aside his divine nature is unbiblical, as we have seen - Christ even revealed his glory on occasion (Jn 1:14, 2:11); but some 'Kenoticists' teach that Christ was denuded of his divine nature or even of any divine consciousness at all, what one writer (La Touche) has called: '*incarnation by divine suicide*'. Several theologians thus develop a new form of Apollinarianism by suggesting that a humanised *logos* was united to a human soul. Christ becomes neither God nor man.

Ekenosen is found in Rm 4:14, 1 Cor 1:17, 9:15 and 2 Cor 9:3 where it is used figuratively to mean: of no effect, of no account, of no reputation, to make void. Thus Christ is said in Phil 2 to make himself of no account, he did not assert his divine authority but became a servant. At the most, if taken literally, Christ laid aside equality with God, assuming a subordinate role for the purpose of redemption. The *kenosis theory* is dangerous because it subverts the doctrines of the Trinity (the Son is emptied of the divine nature and so a person is removed from the Trinity) and God's immutability (the divine nature is changed, also the divine attributes are separated from the divine essence).

¹¹ The New Testament frequently emphasises one nature or the other by using 'Jesus' or 'Christ'. This is the reason why the names are sometimes reversed in order by Paul. 'Christ Jesus' emphasises his ascended divine glory as the Lord; 'Jesus Christ' emphasises his humanity, hence his humility, work of redemption and revelation of the Father. Although this cannot be pressed too far, it is particularly noteworthy in the prison epistles (Eph, Phil, Col); e.g. Eph 1 (after the introductory greeting in v1, referring to the life of the church in the ascended Christ) uses 'Jesus Christ' as the focus of sonship (heavenly references use the simplified name, 'Christ'); while Eph 2 uses 'Christ Jesus' since its main focus is heaven, i.e. we are seated with 'Christ Jesus' in heavenly places, not with 'Jesus Christ'. While interesting, we must be careful not to make too much of this.

Appendix Two

Apollinarianism

Christ had a human soul but this did not mean that there were two personalities as a result. This is hard to rationalise and has led to a constant re-appearance of the heresy of Apollinarianism which, in various ways, teaches that the *logos* (divine nature) took the place of the human soul of Christ. But note:

- The unity of God affirms that the divine nature of Christ is the same nature as the rest of the Godhead. He has no separate divine nature. If the *logos* took the place of the human soul of Christ, then the whole Trinity was incarnated. Either this or there are three gods not a Trinity, since each person would have to have a separate divine being.
- The idea destroys the perfection and unchangeableness of God.
- There is no Biblical text which speaks of the substitution of the divine nature for the human soul/spirit.
- There is no indication that the incarnation resulted in only a partial human nature.
- How can scripture call Christ a man if he wasn't a real man? A body without a soul and spirit is not human.
- If Christ had no human soul, works in the body could not be true righteousness according to scripture.
- Christ performed spiritual acts as a man (e.g. prayer to the Father).
- Christ clearly expressed a human soul: he thought, willed, showed affection etc.
- Christ manifested normal human weakness arising from inner trials (e.g. Gethsemane).
- The human soul of Christ was strengthened and gifted by the Holy Spirit (Lk 3:22, 4:1, 14, 17, 18). This would not be possible or necessary if his soul was divine.
- Angels also ministered to Christ; this would not be necessary if his soul was divine.
- We see evidences of limitation in Christ which would not be possible if his soul was divine: he was surprised by unbelief, he advanced in wisdom, he didn't know the time of the final judgment, he was subject to his parents.
- Christ's personal prayers make no sense if it is not a human soul praying (Mk 14:33).
- A divine soul could not be troubled (Jn 12:27).
- How could Christ atone for soulish and spiritual sin if he had neither a human soul or spirit?

There is no doubt that Christ had a fully human soul and spirit.

Bibliography

- Berkhof, Louis** *Systematic Theology*, Banner of Truth (1971).
Boyce, James P. *Abstract of Systematic Theology*, Christian Gospel
 Foundation, (No date, originally published 1887).
Elwell, Walter *The Concise Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, Baker,
 (1991).
Gill, John *Body of Divinity*, Baker, (1978). This work has proved to be
 most useful in developing parts of this paper and is
 acknowledged as such here.
Hoeksema, Herman *Reformed Dogmatics*, Reformed Free Publishing Association,
 (1985).

Technical Works

The Friberg Analytical Lexicon
The Louw-Nida Greek-English Lexicon
Thayer's Greek Lexicon
The Whitaker Revised BDB Lexicon

Paul Fahy © Copyright 1999
Understanding Ministries